



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/383,981	08/26/1999	KEN HAYWOOD	45429.79728	7242

7590 01/14/2004

OLIFF & BERRIDGE
P.O. BOX 19928
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320

EXAMINER

GHEE, ASHANTI

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2626

DATE MAILED: 01/14/2004

16

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/383,981

Applicant(s)

HAYWOOD ET AL.

Examiner

Ashanti Ghee

Art Unit

2626

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 November 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-7,9-12,14-18 and 20-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-7,9-12,14-18 and 20-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 8/26/99 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 2626

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the following communications: amendment C filed on 11/21/03.
2. This application has been reconsidered. Claims 1, 3-7, 9-12, 14-18, and 20-29 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

4. Claims 1, 6, 26, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Savitzky et al. (US Patent No. 6,012,083).

Art Unit: 2626

Regarding claim 1, Savitzky discloses a method for submitting a document in electronic form to a service bureau for printing comprising the steps of: displaying (showing) plural printer routing options (printer locations read on plural printer routing options), one of the printer routing options (printer locations) being a service bureau (printer agency 60 reads on service bureau) for printing (col. 13, lines 15-28); receiving a print command input (inherent in print a document requested by a user) to the computer (Client A) for printing at the service bureau (60) a document (document 66) stored in memory (storage devices) accessible to the computer (col. 11, lines 48-col. 13, lines 1-14); responsive to the print command, routing the document (document) over the Internet (www element in Fig. 5) to a service bureau (60) for printing (col. 12, lines 42-col. 13, lines 1-44), comprising; automatically activating a communication browser (which reads on a printer agency 60 rendering print preview for display when a print document request is made by the user; col. 12, lines 42-48) program (document-centric interface) in the computer ("when a user requests via a browser that an HTML document 66 to be printed on printer 62, the user simply sends a request for document 66 to printer agency 60" reads on automatically activating a communication browser program) upon selection of the print command (col. 12, lines 66-col. 13, lines 1-14); and transmitting the document (document) to a server (server A) associated with the service bureau (proxy agent 36 reads on service bureau; col. 11, lines 48-col. 12, lines 1-10).

Regarding claim 26, Savitzky discloses a storage medium storing a set of program instructions executable on a data processing device and usable to submit a document in electronic form to a service bureau, the set of program instructions

Art Unit: 2626

comprising: instructions (commands read on instructions; col. 9, lines 37-53) for displaying (showing) plural printer routing options (printer locations read on plural printer routing options; col. 13, lines 15-28); instructions for inputting a selection of one of the printer routing options (printer locations), one of the plural printer routing options (printer locations) being the Internet print request (requests an HTML document to be printed on printer reads on Internet print request; col. 13, lines 1-28); instructions for receiving a print command input (inherent in print a document requested by a user) to the computer (Client A) for printing at the service bureau (60) a document (document 66) stored in memory (storage devices) accessible to the computer (col. 11, lines 48-col. 13, lines 1-14); instructions for routing the document (document) over the Internet (www element in Fig. 5) to a service bureau (60) for printing (col. 12, lines 42-col. 13, lines 1-44), comprising; instructions for automatically activating a communication browser (which reads on a printer agency 60 rendering print preview for display when a print document request is made by the user; col. 12, lines 42-48) program (document-centric interface) in the computer ("when a user requests via a browser that an HTML document 66 to be printed on printer 62, the user simply sends a request for document 66 to printer agency 60" reads on automatically activating a communication browser program) upon selection of the print command (col. 12, lines 66-col. 13, lines 1-14); instructions for transmitting the document (document) to a server (server A) associated with the service bureau (proxy agent 36 reads on service bureau; col. 11, lines 48-col. 12, lines 1-10).

Regarding claim 6, Savitzky discloses the method wherein said receiving the print command includes receiving the print command from within an active application (col. 12, lines 58-col. 13, lines 1-14).

Regarding claim 27, Savitzky discloses the storage medium wherein the set of program instructions further comprises instructions for operating the Internet print request while an application is active during operation (col. 12, lines 58-col. 13, lines 1-14).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 23 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Savitzky et al. (US Patent No. 6,012,083) in view of Shiohara (US Patent Publication No. US 2003/0011806 A1).

Regarding claim 23, Savitzky does not disclose the printer destinations are selected from at least one of an Internet print shop printer, local network printers and direct network printers. However, Shiohara discloses the method wherein the printer destinations are selected from at least one of an Internet print shop printer, local

Art Unit: 2626

network printers (the network connection section 29 to the selected printer reads on local network printers) and direct network printers (paragraphs 54-55).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would combine the teachings of Savitzky and Shiohara due to both references disclosing selection of plural printers to provide a system for generating print data in a manner compatible for use by a plurality of printers in a printing system.

Regarding claim 29, Savitzky does not disclose the storage medium wherein the set of program instructions further comprises instructions for selecting an appropriate printer driver that includes at least one of an Internet print shop printer, local network printer, and direct network printer.

However, Shiohara discloses the storage medium wherein the set of program instructions further comprises instructions for selecting an appropriate printer driver that includes at least one of an Internet print shop printer, local network printer(the network connection section 29 to the selected printer reads on local network printers) and direct network printers (paragraphs 54-55).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would combine the teachings of Savitzky and Shiohara due to both references disclosing selection of plural printers to provide a system for generating print data in a manner compatible for use by a plurality of printers in a printing system.

6. Claims 3, 5, 7, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Savitzky et al. (US Patent No. 6,012,083) in view of Shiohara (US Patent Publication No. US 2003/0011806 A1) further in view of Tonkin (US Patent No. 6,134,568).

Regarding claim 3, Savitzky and Shiohara do not disclose the method, wherein receiving the print command, further comprising: retrieving a print web page from the server, print web page including information identifying plural print job options; displaying the print web page on the computer, the web page including a print job order form; and responsive to a user selection of one or more print job options identified on the print job order form, transmitting the print job order form to the service bureau.

However, Tonkin discloses the method further comprising the steps of: retrieving an Internet print web page (facility's home web page) from the server (processing facility reads on the server; col. 5, lines 53-col. 6, lines 1-8), the Internet print web page including information identifying plural print job options (col. 7, lines 12-65); displaying the Internet print web page (facility's home web page) on the computer (remote terminal reads on the computer; col. 5, lines 39-67), the Internet web page including a print job order form (col. 13, lines 25-51); and responsive to a user selection of one or more print job options identified on the print job order form, transmitting the print job order form to the service bureau (col. 13, lines 13-41).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would combine the teachings of Savitzky, Shiohara, and Tonkin due to the references disclosing Internet printing systems to allow a user to

preview a document prior to assembly to prevent any miscommunication problems that may arise.

Regarding claim 5, Savitzky discloses the method wherein the print job options include service bureau location (col. 11, lines 1-21).

Regarding claim 7, Savitzky and Shiohara do not disclose the method wherein the active application can be any one of a word processing program, a database program, a graphics program, or a multimedia program.

However, Tonkin discloses the method wherein the active application can be any one of a word processing program, a database program, a graphics program (evident in Java applet), or a multimedia program (col. 5, lines 39-52).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would combine the teachings of Savitzky, Shiohara, and Tonkin due to the references disclosing Internet printing systems to allow a user to preview a document prior to assembly to prevent any miscommunication problems that may arise.

Regarding claim 10, Savitzky and Shiohara do not disclose the method further comprising receiving an acknowledgment that the document has been submitted to the service bureau for printing.

However, Tonkin discloses the method further comprising the step of receiving an acknowledgment that the document has been submitted to the service bureau for printing (col. 14, lines 24-29).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would combine the teachings of Savitzky, Shiohara, and Tonkin due to the references disclosing Internet printing systems to allow a user to preview a document prior to assembly to prevent any miscommunication problems that may arise.

7. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Savitzky et al. (US Patent No. 6,012,083) in view of Shiohara (US Patent Publication No. US 2003/0011806 A1) in view of Tonkin (US Patent No. 6,134,568) further in view of Cheng et al. (US Patent No. 6,012,070).

Regarding claim 4, Savitzky, Shiohara, and Tonkin do not disclose the method wherein the server is an intermediary server, and transmitting the print job order form includes transmitting the print job order form by the way of the server to a server of the service bureau.

However, Cheng discloses the method wherein the server is an intermediary server, and transmitting (transmission) the print job order form (print order contracts read on print job order form) includes transmitting (transmission) the print job order form (print order contracts) by the way of the server (server station 100) to a server (customer service station 105) of the service bureau (production station 106 reads on the service bureau; col. 9, lines 44-col. 11, lines 1-11).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would combine the teachings of Savitzky, Shiohara,

Tonkin, and Cheng due to all references disclosing an Internet printing system to allow simple yet professional looking creation of customized business forms or brochures and provide transmission of those forms or brochures to a printing facility.

8. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Savitzky et al. (US Patent No. 6,012,083) in view of Cheng et al. (US Patent No. 6,012,070).

Regarding claim 9, Savitzky does not disclose the method wherein another of the printer routing options is a direct-networked printer.

However, Cheng discloses the method wherein another of the printer routing options is a direct-networked printer (col. 5, lines 46-col. 6, lines 1-2).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would combine the teachings of Savitzky and Cheng due to all references disclosing an Internet printing system to allow simple yet professional looking creation of customized business forms or brochures and provide transmission of those forms or brochures to a printing facility.

9. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Savitzky et al. (US Patent No. 6,012,083) in view of Bellucco et al. (US Patent No. 5,524,085).

Regarding claim 11, Savitzky does not disclose the method wherein the document includes multimedia content.

However, Bellucco discloses the method wherein the document includes multimedia content (col. 4, lines 23-col. 5, lines 1-14).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would combine the teachings of Savitzky and Bellucco due to the references disclosing printing systems to provide additional space with a job-ticket containing special instructions.

10. Claims 12, 15-18, 21-22, and 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tonkin (US Patent No. 6,134,568) in view of Shiohara (US Patent Publication No. US 2003/0011806 A1) further in view of Savitzky et al. (US Patent No. 6,012,083).

Regarding claim 12, Tonkin discloses a computing machine comprising: a computer (remote terminal) controlled by software modules (inherent in client terminal having software modules; col. 5, lines 28-col. 6, lines 1-20); a first module (inherent in processing facility 16) to sense an Internet print request (monitors for requests reads on sense an Internet print request; col. 5, lines 39-67); and a second module (inherent in processing facility 16) to automatically launch a communications program ("an initial document creation window and a Java applet which can be executed on a remote terminal to enable a user to preview a specified document" reads on automatically activating a communication browser program; col. 5, lines 39-col. 6, lines 1-20) module (document creation window) to access a server (inherent within the document production location) associated with a service bureau at a predefined address (processing facility routes a message addressed to that document production location reads on predefined message; col. 3, lines 41-col. 4, lines 1-24), the server providing a

Art Unit: 2626

browser with a print order form (col. 5, lines 39-col. 6, lines 1-20); a third module (graphical user interface) to display the print order form (order information reads on the print order form; col. 6, lines 1-63); and a fourth module (inherent in processing facility 16) to transmit print order data and a document to be printed to the server providing the browser with the print order form (col. 6, lines 1-63).

Although Tonkin does not specifically disclose the computer controlled by modules selects the appropriate printer destinations, Shiohara discloses wherein the computer (personal computer) controlled by modules (execution modules read on modules) selects the appropriate printer destinations (listed printers based on print contents and so on read on the appropriate printer destinations; paragraph 47 and paragraphs 72-73).

Although Tonkin and Shiohara do not disclose the first module displaying plural printer routing options, Savitzky discloses the first module displaying (showing) plural printer routing options (printer locations read on plural printer routing options), one of the printer routing options (printer locations) being the Internet print request (requests an HTML document to be printed on printer reads on Internet print request; col. 13, lines 1-28).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would combine the teachings of Tonkin, Shiohara, and Savitzky due to all of the references disclosing Internet printing systems to allow for general agent execution at a locus specified by the user independently of the server or client which might be used.

Regarding claim 15, Tonkin and Savitzky do not disclose the machine wherein said first module is for sensing print requests for direct networked printers.

However, Shiohara discloses the machine wherein said first module (print request router 26 reads on first module) is for sensing print requests (print request reads on print requests) for direct (see Fig. 2) networked (network connection section 29) printers (printers read on printers; paragraph 28 and paragraphs 47-55).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would combine the teachings of Tonkin, Shiohara, and Savitzky due to all of the references disclosing Internet printing systems to allow for general agent execution at a locus specified by the user independently of the server or client which might be used.

Regarding claim 16, Tonkin discloses the machine further comprising an applications module (graphical user interface) which is active when during operation of said first and second modules (col. 6, lines 22-col. 7, lines 1-11).

Regarding claim 17, Tonkin discloses the machine wherein the applications module can be any one of a word processing program, a database program, a graphics program (Java applet), or a multimedia program (col. 5, lines 39-52).

Regarding claim 18, Tonkin discloses a computer readable medium to control a computer and having modules stored therein, the media comprising: a first module (inherent in processing facility 16) to sense an Internet print request (monitors for requests reads on sense an Internet print request; col. 5, lines 39-67); and a second module (inherent in processing facility 16) to launch a communications program ("an

Art Unit: 2626

initial document creation window and a Java applet which can be executed on a remote terminal to enable a user to preview a specified document" reads on automatically activating a communication browser program; col. 5, lines 39-col. 6, lines 1-20) module (document creation window) to access a server (inherent within the document production location) associated with a service bureau at a predefined address (processing facility routes a message addressed to that document production location reads on predefined message; col. 3, lines 41-col. 4, lines 1-24), the server providing a browser with a print order form (col. 5, lines 39-col. 6, lines 1-20); a third module (graphical user interface) to display the print order form (order information reads on the print order form; col. 6, lines 1-63); and a fourth module (inherent in processing facility 16) to transmit print order data and a document to be printed to the server providing the browser with the print order form (col. 6, lines 1-63).

Although Tonkin does not specifically disclose the computer controlled by the modules selects the appropriate printer destination, Shiohara discloses wherein the computer (personal computer) controlled by the modules (execution modules read on modules) selects the appropriate printer destination (listed printers based on print contents and so on read on the appropriate printer destinations; paragraph 47 and paragraphs 72-73).

Although Tonkin and Shiohara do not disclose the first module displaying plural printer routing options, Savitzky discloses the first module displaying (showing) plural printer routing options (printer locations read on plural printer routing options), one of the printer routing options (printer locations) being the Internet print request (requests

an HTML document to be printed on printer reads on Internet print request; col. 13, lines 1-28).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would combine the teachings of Tonkin, Shiohara, and Savitzky due to all of the references disclosing Internet printing systems to allow for general agent execution at a locus specified by the user independently of the server or client which might be used.

Regarding claim 21, Tonkin discloses the computer readable medium further comprising an applications module (graphical user interface) which is active when during operation of said first and second modules (col. 6, lines 22-col. 7, lines 1-11).

Regarding claim 22, Tonkin discloses the computer readable medium the applications module can be any one of a word processing program, a database program, a graphics program (Java applet), or a multimedia program (col. 5, lines 39-52).

Regarding claim 24, Tonkin and Savitzky do not disclose the machine wherein the printer destinations are selected from at least one of an Internet print shop printer, local network printers and direct network printers. However, Shiohara discloses the method wherein the printer destinations are selected from at least one of an Internet print shop printer, local network printers (the network connection section 29 to the selected printer reads on local network printers) and direct network printers (paragraphs 54-55).

Art Unit: 2626

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would combine the teachings of Tonkin, Savitzky, and Shiohara due to all of the references disclosing Internet printing systems to provide a system for generating print data in a manner compatible for use by a plurality of printers in a printing system.

Regarding claim 25, Tonkin and Savitzky do not disclose the machine wherein the printer destinations are selected from at least one of an Internet print shop printer, local network printers and direct network printers. However, Shiohara discloses the method wherein the printer destinations are selected from at least one of an Internet print shop printer, local network printers (the network connection section 29 to the selected printer reads on local network printers) and direct network printers (paragraphs 54-55).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would combine the teachings of Tonkin, Savitzky, and Shiohara due to all of the references disclosing Internet printing systems to provide a system for generating print data in a manner compatible for use by a plurality of printers in a printing system.

11. Claims 14 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tonkin (US Patent No. 6,134,568) in view of Shiohara (US Patent Publication No. US 2003/0011806 A1) further in view of Savitzky et al. (US Patent No. 6,012,083) further in view of Bellucco et al. (US Patent No. 5,524,085).

Regarding claim 14, Tonkin, Shiohara, and Savitzky do not disclose the machine wherein the document to be printed includes multimedia content.

However, Bellucco discloses the machine wherein the document to be printed includes multimedia content (col. 4, lines 23-col. 5, lines 1-14).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would combine the teachings of Tonkin, Shiohara, Savitzky, and Bellucco due to the references disclosing printing systems to provide additional space with a job-ticket containing special instructions.

Regarding claim 20, Tonkin, Shiohara, and Savitzky do not disclose the computer readable medium wherein the document to be printed includes multimedia content.

However, Bellucco discloses the computer readable medium wherein the document to be printed includes multimedia content (col. 4, lines 23-col. 5, lines 1-14).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would combine the teachings of Tonkin, Shiohara, Savitzky, and Bellucco due to the references disclosing printing systems to provide additional space with a job-ticket containing special instructions.

12. Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Savitzky et al. (US Patent No. 6,012,083) in view of Tonkin (US Patent No. 6,134,568).

Regarding claim 28, Savitzky does not disclose the storage medium wherein instructions for operating the Internet print request while an application is active comprises instructions defining at least one of a word processing program, a database program, a graphics program, or a multimedia program.

However, Tonkin discloses the storage medium wherein instructions for operating the Internet print request while an application is active comprises instructions defining at least one of a word processing program, a database program, a graphics program (evident in Java applet), or a multimedia program (col. 5, lines 39-52).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would combine the teachings of Savitzky and Tonkin due to the references disclosing Internet printing systems to allow a user to preview a document prior to assembly to prevent any miscommunication problems that may arise.

Conclusion

13. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

Art Unit: 2626

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ashanti Ghee whose telephone number is (703) 306-3443. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs and alt. Fri. (7-4PM).


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kimberly A. Williams can be reached on (703) 305-4863. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9313.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.



AG
January 6, 2004

Ashanti Ghee
Examiner
Art Unit 2626


KIMBERLY WILLIAMS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER